arXiv:physics/0407123v1 [physics.atom-ph] 23 Jul 2004

Relativistic and QED corrections to the g factor of Li-like ions

D. A. Glazov,[1,2] V. M. Shabaev,[1,3] I. I. Tupitsyn,[1]
A. V. Volotka,[1,3] V. A. Yerokhin,[1,2,4] G. Plunien,[3] and G. Soff[3]

[1] *Department of Physics,*
St. Petersburg State University,
Oulianovskaya 1, Petrodvorets,
St. Petersburg 198504, Russia
[2] *Max-Planck-Institut für Physik Komplexer Systeme,*
Nöthnitzer Str. 38,
D-01187 Dresden, Germany
[3] *Institut für Theoretische Physik,*
TU Dresden, Mommsenstraße 13,
D-01062 Dresden, Germany
[4] *Center for Advanced Studies,*
St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University,
Polytekhnicheskaya 29,
St. Petersburg 195251, Russia

Abstract

Calculations of various corrections to the g factor of Li-like ions are presented, which result in a significant improvement of the theoretical accuracy in the region $Z = 6-92$. The configuration-interaction Dirac-Fock method is employed for the evaluation of the interelectronic-interaction correction of order $1/Z^2$ and higher. This correction is combined with the $1/Z$ interelectronic-interaction term derived within a rigorous QED approach. The one-electron QED corrections of first in α are calculated to all orders in the parameter αZ. The screening of QED corrections is taken into account to the leading orders in αZ and $1/Z$.

PACS numbers: 12.20.Ds, 31.30.Jv, 31.30.Gs

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent high-precision measurements of g factors of H-like carbon [1, 2] and oxygen [3] have provided a possibility for studying binding QED effects in an external magnetic field in these systems. The experiments were performed on single H-like ions confined in a Penning ion trap at low temperatures. A relative accuracy of 5×10^{-10} was obtained in Ref. [2] for the ratio of the electronic Larmor precession frequency ω_L and the ion cyclotron frequency ω_c, which is connected with the g-factor value by

$$\frac{\omega_L}{\omega_c} = \frac{g}{2} \frac{|e|}{q} \frac{m_{\text{ion}}}{m} \,, \tag{1}$$

where e is the elementary charge unit, q is the charge of the ion, m_{ion} is the ion mass, and m is the electron mass. The experimental results are shown to be sensitive to one- and two-loop binding QED effects and to the nuclear-recoil corrections. Further progress is anticipated from the experimental side, as well as an extension of measurements to the ions with more than one electron.

New perspectives for testing QED effects in g factors of highly charged ions motivated numerous theoretical investigations on this subject during the last years. We mention here numerical calculations of the one-loop self-energy correction to all orders in αZ [4, 5, 6, 7, 8], numerical [5, 6] and analytical [9, 10, 11] evaluations of the one-loop vacuum-polarization contribution, analytical results for the nuclear-size correction [9, 12], and calculations of the nuclear-recoil effects [13, 14, 15, 16] and two-loop binding QED corrections [17, 18, 19]. As a result of these studies, the present theoretical accuracy of the g-factor values is several times better than that of the experimental results. An important consequence of the investigations of the g factor is the possibility to determine the electron mass from Eq. (1) by combining the theoretical g-factor value and the experimental result for ω_L/ω_c. We note that the 1998 CODATA value for the electron mass [20] has an error of 2×10^{-9}, which is 4 times larger than the experimental uncertainty of the result for carbon [2] and 3 times larger than the one for oxygen [3]. A new determination of the electron mass presented in Refs. [3, 7, 14, 21] provided an improvement of the accuracy of the electron mass by a factor of 4. As a result, the 2002 CODATA value for the electron mass [22] is derived mainly from the g factor of H-like ions. It is expected that in the future an extension of experimental investigations towards higher-Z ions could lead also to an independent determination of the fine structure constant α [18, 23].

The accuracy of theoretical values for the g factor of high-Z H-like ions is presently limited by nuclear effects [15, 24]. The uncertainty introduced by them in the high-Z region is comparable with the binding QED correction of second order in α. Since the nuclear effects do not allow an accurate theoretical description at present, this puts a serious obstacle on the way to improvement of theoretical predictions and to an identification of two-loop QED corrections in future experiments. However, it was recently shown [25, 26] that the uncertainty due to the nuclear effects can be significantly reduced in a specific combination of the g factors of H- and Li-like ions with the same nucleus,

$$g' = g_{(1s)^2\,2s} - \xi\, g_{1s}\,, \tag{2}$$

where g_{1s} and $g_{(1s)^2\,2s}$ are the g factors of H- and Li-like ions, respectively, and the parameter ξ is calculated numerically, as explained in Ref. [25]. Numerical calculations show that the influence of the nuclear effects on the difference g' is by two orders of magnitude smaller than that on the g-factor values g_{1s} and $g_{(1s)^2\,2s}$ separately. Therefore, the specific difference g' can be in principle studied up to much higher accuracy than the g factor of an H-like or Li-like ion. In order to realize this project, one need to perform theoretical and experimental investigations of the g factor of Li-like ions with an accuracy comparable to that for H-like ions.

Extending theoretical description from an H-like to a Li-like ion, one encounters a serious complication due to the presence of additional electrons. Moreover, all contributions to the $g-2$ value for an ns state are of pure relativistic and QED origin, which makes the treatment of the electron correlation much more intricate than, e.g., in calculating the binding energies. A number of relativistic calculations of the g factor of Li-like ions were carried out previously [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32]. However, in order to reach the accuracy comparable to the one for H-like ions, a systematic treatment of the QED corrections is required. In our previous publications [25, 26], we presented theoretical values for the g factor of Li-like ions including all presently known QED, nuclear, and interelectronic-interaction corrections for a wide range of the nuclear-charge number Z. The goal of the present investigation is to improve these theoretical predictions by calculating several corrections that provide the leading uncertainty to the theoretical values.

For low-Z ions, the uncertainty of the g-factor values [25, 26] was mainly determined by the error due to the interelectronic-interaction correction. A part of this correction that is of first order in $1/Z$ was evaluated in Ref. [25] within a rigorous QED approach, whereas the remainder (of order $1/Z^2$ and higher) was extracted from the variational calculations by Yan [30, 31] in case of low-Z ions and from the many-body perturbation theory calculations by Lindroth and Ynnerman [29] for high-Z ions. In the present work, we evaluate the interelectronic-interaction correction of order $1/Z^2$ and higher by a large-scale configuration-interaction Dirac-Fock method.

For middle- and high-Z ions, the main error of the theoretical values of Ref. [25] originated from the binding QED correction. In that work, it was evaluated to the leading order in αZ [namely, $(\alpha Z)^2$] and to the zeroth order in $1/Z$. In the present investigation, we employ the recent calculation of the self-energy term of the one-electron QED correction to all orders in αZ [8] and calculate the vacuum-polarization term. We also evaluate the screened QED correction to its leading orders in αZ and $1/Z$.

The relativistic units ($\hbar = c = 1$) and the Heaviside charge unit ($\alpha = e^2/(4\pi), e < 0$) are used in the paper.

II. FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

The g factor of an atom with a spinless nucleus is defined as

$$g = \frac{1}{\mu_0 J} \frac{\partial E(\mathcal{H})}{\partial \mathcal{H}} \bigg|_{\mathcal{H}=0} = \frac{1}{\mu_0 J} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{H}} \langle \Psi \mid H \mid \Psi \rangle \bigg|_{\mathcal{H}=0}, \tag{3}$$

where H is the Hamiltonian of the atom in magnetic field $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}$, $\mathcal{H} = |\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}|$ and the z axis is directed along $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}$, $E(\mathcal{H})$ is the energy of the state with the maximal ($M_J = J$) projection of the angular momentum on the z axis, and $\mu_0 = |e|/(2m)$ is the Bohr magneton. If the perturbation theory of first order in $\mathcal{H}$ is used to obtain the energy shift $\Delta E(\mathcal{H})$, Eq. (3) can be written as

$$g = \frac{1}{\mu_0 J} \frac{\Delta E(\mathcal{H})}{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{4}$$

In what follows, we will use both definitions.

In the case of a high-Z Li-like ion, in the zeroth-order approximation one can neglect the interaction of the $2s$ electron with the closed $(1s)^2$ shell. We thus use the one-electron Dirac equation as the starting point in our evaluation of the g factor. The corresponding Hamiltonian is

$$h = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \beta m + V + V^{\rm magn}, \tag{5}$$

where $V = -\alpha Z/r$ is the Coulomb potential induced by the nucleus and $V^{\rm magn} = -e\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ represents the interaction with the magnetic field. For the homogeneous magnetic field the vector potential is $\mathbf{A} = 1/2[\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}} \times \mathbf{r}]$ and thus $V^{\rm magn} = -(e/2)\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}} \cdot [\mathbf{r} \times \boldsymbol{\alpha}]$.

Evaluating the energy shift as the expectation value of $V^{\rm magn}$ with the Dirac wave functions, we obtain the lowest-order g-factor value for the $2s$ state,

$$g_{\rm D} = \frac{2}{3}\left(1 + \sqrt{2 + 2\gamma}\right) = 2 - \frac{(\alpha Z)^2}{6} + \ldots, \tag{6}$$

where $\gamma = \sqrt{1-(\alpha Z)^2}$. Various corrections to $g_{\rm D}$ arise due to the interelectronic interaction ($\Delta g_{\rm int}$), one-electron QED effects ($\Delta g_{\rm QED}$), the screened QED effects ($\Delta g_{\rm SQED}$), and nuclear effects ($\Delta g_{\rm nuc}$). We thus write the total theoretical value for the g factor as

$$g = g_{\rm D} + \Delta g_{\rm int} + \Delta g_{\rm QED} + \Delta g_{\rm SQED} + \Delta g_{\rm nuc}\,, \tag{7}$$

with the corrections $\Delta g_{\rm int}$, $\Delta g_{\rm QED}$, $\Delta g_{\rm SQED}$, and $\Delta g_{\rm nuc}$ evaluated in Sections III, IV, V, and VI, respectively.

III. INTERELECTRONIC INTERACTION

To evaluate the interelectronic-interaction effects, we start with the relativistic Hamiltonian in the no-pair approximation,

$$H = \Lambda_+ \Big(\sum_j h(j) + H^{\rm int}\Big)\Lambda_+, \qquad H^{\rm int} = H^{\rm C} + H^{\rm B}\,, \tag{8}$$

where h is the one-particle Dirac Hamiltonian (5), the index $j = 1\ldots N$ numerates the electrons, $H^{\rm C}$ is the Coulomb interaction, $H^{\rm B}$ is the Breit interaction, and Λ_+ is the projector on the positive-energy states, which is the product of the one-electron projectors $\lambda_+(i)$,

$$\Lambda_+ = \lambda_+(1)\cdots\lambda_+(N)\,. \tag{9}$$

Here,

$$\lambda_+(i) = \sum_n \mid u_n(i)\rangle\langle u_n(i)\mid\,, \tag{10}$$

where $u_n(i)$ are the positive-energy eigenstates of an effective one-particle Hamiltonian h_u. Two different Hamiltonians h and $h^{\rm HFD}$ were considered as the operator h_u, where h is the one-electron Dirac Hamiltonian (5) and $h^{\rm HFD}$ is the Hartree-Fock-Dirac operator without the Breit interaction but including the interaction with the external field [33, 34]. However, since $h^{\rm HFD}$ corresponds to a better zero approximation and, therefore, provides much faster convergence, all the final results were obtained with this Hamiltonian. In both cases the functions u_n and hence the projector Λ_+ depend on the external magnetic field. Therefore, the derivative with respect to $\mathcal{H}$ in Eq. (3) contains not only the derivative of the one-electron part of the Hamiltonian (8), but also the derivative of the projector Λ_+. The derivative of Λ_+ can be obtained explicitly and one can show that its contribution to the g factor is equivalent to the contribution of the negative-energy states.

In our computational approach, we obtain the g-factor value by using Eq. (3) in the finite-difference approximation,

$$g = \frac{1}{\mu_0 J} \frac{E(\delta\mathcal{H}) - E(-\delta\mathcal{H})}{2\,\delta\mathcal{H}} + O[(\delta\mathcal{H})^3]\,, \tag{11}$$

since the Hellman-Feynman theorem is not exactly fulfilled for the approximate wave functions. The optimal choice of the finite difference $\delta\mathcal{H}$ was found to be $0.001\,(\mathrm{a.u.}/\mu_0)$. We checked that scaling this value by a factor of 2 does not influence our results for the g factor.

In order to determine the space of one-electron functions $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^{M}$, we employed the combined Dirac-Fock (DF) ($j = 1, \ldots, m$) and the Dirac-Fock-Sturm (DFS) ($j = m+1, \ldots, M$) basis set. The index j here enumerates different occupied and vacant one-electron states. The external magnetic field and the Breit interaction were not included in the DF and DFS operators, when the basis set was generated. For the occupied atomic shells, the orbitals φ_j were obtained by the restricted DF method, based on a numerical solution of the radial DF equations. The vacant orbitals φ_j ($j = m+1, \ldots, M$) were obtained by solving the Dirac-Fock-Sturm equations

$$\left[h^{\mathrm{DF}} - \varepsilon_{j_0}\right] \tilde{\varphi}_j = \lambda_j W(r) \tilde{\varphi}_j\,, \qquad j = m+1, \ldots, M, \tag{12}$$

where h^{DF} is the Dirac-Fock operator, ε_{j_0} is the one-electron energy of the occupied DF orbital φ_{j_0}, and $W(r)$ is a constant-sign weight function. The parameter λ_j in Eq. (12) can be considered as an eigenvalue of the Sturmian operator. If $W(r) \to 0$ at $r \to \infty$, all Sturmian functions φ_j have the same asymptotics at $r \to \infty$. It is clear that for $\lambda_j = 0$ the Sturmian function coincides with the reference DF orbital φ_{j_0}. The widely used choice of the weight function is $W(r) = 1/r$, which leads to the well-known “charge quantization”. In the relativistic case this choice is not very successful. In our calculations we used the following weight function

$$W(r) = \frac{1 - \exp[-(\alpha r)^2]}{(\alpha r)^2}\,, \tag{13}$$

which, unlike $1/r$, is regular at the origin. It is well known that the Sturmian operator is Hermitian and, contrary to the Fock operator, does not have the continuum spectra. Therefore, the set of the Sturmian eigenfunctions including the negative-energy states forms the discrete and complete basis set in the space of one-electron wave functions. This basis set is orthogonal with the weight function $W(r)$.

To generate the one-electron wave functions ψ_n, we used the unrestricted DF method in the joined DF and DFS basis,

$$\psi_n = \sum_j C_{jn} \varphi_j\,. \tag{14}$$

The coefficients C_{jn} were obtained by solving HFD matrix equations

$$\hat{F}\mathbf{C}_n = \varepsilon_n \hat{S}\mathbf{C}_n, \tag{15}$$

where $\hat{F}$ is the Dirac-Fock matrix in the joined basis of DF and DFS orbitals of a free ion. The external magnetic field was included in the $\hat{F}$ matrix, whereas the Breit interaction was not. The matrix $\hat{S}$ in Eq. (15) is nonorthogonal, since the DFS orbitals are not orthogonal in the usual sense. The negative-energy DFS functions were included in the total basis set. Eq. (15) was used to generate the whole set of orthogonal one-electron wave functions $\psi_n (n = 1, \dots M)$, including all vacant states.

It should be noted that even if the external magnetic field $\mathcal{H}$ is equal to zero, the set of one-electron functions ψ_n differs from the set of basis functions φ_j. For the occupied states, the unrestricted DF method accounts for the core-polarization effects (the spin polarization in our case), in contrast to the restricted DF method. For the vacant states the difference is more significant, since the DF and DFS operators are essentially different.

The large-scale configuration-interaction Dirac-Fock (CI-DF) method was used to solve the Dirac-Coulomb-Breit equation in the external magnetic field

$$H\Psi(\gamma M_J) = E(\gamma M_J)\,\Psi(\gamma M_J) \tag{16}$$

where H is the non-pair Hamiltonian (8). The many-electron wave function $\Psi(\gamma M_J)$ with quantum numbers γ and M_J was expanded in terms of a large number of the Slater determinants (SD) with the same projection M_J of the total angular momentum J

$$\Psi(\gamma M_J) = \sum_\alpha c_\alpha(\gamma M_J)\,\mathrm{det}_\alpha(M_J). \tag{17}$$

The configuration state functions (CSFs) with angular momentum J were not used in our calculations, since the Hamiltonian H contains the interaction with the external magnetic field and, therefore, does not commute with the operator J^2. The Slater determinants are constructed from the one-electron wave functions ψ_n (14). The same orbitals were used in Eq. (10) in order to construct the projector Λ_+. The basis of one-electron functions used in our calculations was $12s\ 11p\ 10d\ 6f\ 4g\ 2h\ 1i$. The set of the SD in expansion (17) was generated including all single, double, and triple excitations. The total number of SD was 552359. The results of the calculation are presented in Table I. The interelectronic-interaction correction $\Delta g_{\text{int}}^{\mathrm{CI-DF}}$ is the difference of the result obtained by Eq. (11) for the point nuclear model and the Dirac g-factor value g_{D} (6).

The result for the $\Delta g_{\rm int}^{\rm CI-DF}$ correction obtained by the CI-DF method can be improved by employing a rigorous QED treatment of the part of this correction that is of order $1/Z$, which was presented in Ref. [25]. In order to combine two different treatments, we isolate the contribution of order $1/Z^2$ and higher from the $\Delta g_{\rm int}^{\rm CI-DF}$ correction by subtracting the value of the $1/Z$ term calculated in the Breit approximation. The resulting "higher-order" correction ($\Delta g_{\rm int}^{(2+)}$) is listed in the third column of Table I. The numerical results for the interelectronic-interaction correction of first order in $1/Z$ ($\Delta g_{\rm int}^{(1)}$) are taken from Ref. [25] and listed in the fourth column. This contribution was evaluated in framework of QED and utilizing the Fermi model for the nuclear-charge distribution. Total results $\Delta g_{\rm int} = \Delta g_{\rm int}^{(1)} + \Delta g_{\rm int}^{(2+)}$ are presented in the last column. The error bars indicated represent a quadratical sum of a numerical error and an estimation of omitted terms, i.e., contributions beyond the Breit approximation to $\Delta g_{\rm int}^{(2+)}$. They were estimated as $(\alpha Z)^2\, \Delta g_{\rm int}^{(2+)}$.

To compare our results with the corresponding Yan's calculations [30, 31], which account for the lowest-order ($\sim \alpha^2$) relativistic effects, we have isolated the α^2 contribution in our CI-DF calculation. It was done by four times increase of the velocity of light (in atomic units) and by an extrapolation of the obtained results (with the α^2 factor isolated) to the $c = \infty$ limit. Table II, which presents the related comparison for $g - 2$ values, shows that for $Z > 5$ the contribution of the higher-order relativistic effects is much larger than the difference between our α^2 results and those of Yan.

IV. ONE-ELECTRON QED CORRECTIONS

To zeroth order in $1/Z$, the QED correction for the ground state of a Li-like ion is given by the one-electron QED contribution evaluated for the $2s$ Dirac state. This correction is represented by a perturbation expansion in the fine-structure constant α,

$$\Delta g_{\rm QED} = \Delta g_{\rm QED}^{(1)} + \Delta g_{\rm QED}^{(2)} + \dots\,, \tag{18}$$

where the superscript indicates the order in α.

The first-order QED correction is given by the sum of the self-energy and vacuum-polarization contributions, $\Delta g_{\rm QED}^{(1)} = \Delta g_{\rm SE}^{(1)} + \Delta g_{\rm VP}^{(1)}$. The self-energy correction for the $2s$ state was recently calculated to all orders in αZ in Ref. [8]. The corresponding results are listed in the second column of Table III. The vacuum-polarization correction consists of two parts that can be thought to originate from the first-order vacuum-polarization diagram with the magnetic interaction inserted into the external electron line (the *electric-loop* contribution $\Delta g^{\rm e}_{\rm VP}$), and into the vacuum-polarization loop (the *magnetic-loop* contribution $\Delta g^{\rm m}_{\rm VP}$). The electric-loop contribution is calculated in the present work by utilizing the known expression for the Uehling potential and approximate formulas for the Wichmann-Kroll potential taken from Ref. [35]. The results of the calculation are presented in the third and fourth columns of Table III. The remaining magnetic-loop correction is known to vanish in the Uehling approximation, and its contribution is small as compared to the electric-loop part. This correction was calculated to all orders in αZ only for the $1s$ state [5, 6]. Because of this, we employ the analytical result of Ref. [11] for its leading contribution in αZ, which reads (for an ns state),

$$\Delta g^{\rm m}_{\rm VP} = \frac{7}{216}\,\frac{\alpha(\alpha Z)^5}{n^3}\,. \tag{19}$$

The corresponding results are listed in the fifth column of Table III. The uncertainty of the magnetic-loop contribution is estimated by comparison of the all-order numerical results of Ref. [6] for the $1s$ state with the lowest-order analytical result (19).

QED corrections of higher orders in α have not been calculated to all orders in αZ up to now. Two first terms of their αZ expansion can be represented by the free-electron $g-2$ factor multiplied by a relativistic kinematical factor [17, 18, 25, 36]. The result yields (for an ns state)

$$\Delta g^{(i)}_{\rm QED} = 2\,\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^i A^{(i)}\,\left(1+\frac{(\alpha Z)^2}{6\,n^2}\right)\,, \tag{20}$$

where $2(\alpha/\pi)^i A^{(i)}$ is the contribution of order α^i to the free-electron g factor. Its numerical values (see [37, 38] and references therein) are

$$A^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2}\,, \tag{21}$$

$$A^{(2)} = -0.328\,478\,965\ldots\,, \tag{22}$$

$$A^{(3)} = 1.181\,241\,456\ldots\,, \tag{23}$$

$$A^{(4)} = -1.7366(384)\,. \tag{24}$$

Recently, a part of the two-loop QED contribution of order $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ was evaluated in Ref. [19] with the result

$$\Delta g^{(2)}_{\rm QED}({\rm h.o.}) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{(\alpha Z)^4}{n^3}\left\{\frac{56}{9}\ln[(\alpha Z)^{-2}] + a_{40}\right\}\,, \tag{25}$$

where the numerical values of the coefficient term are $a^{(2)}_{40}(1s) = -18.477\,948\,664\,(1)$ and $a^{(2)}_{40}(2s) = -19.781\,820\,939\,(1)$. This expression accounts for the complete logarithmic dependence in this order and the dominant part of the constant term. We observe, however, that in the one-loop case, inclusion of the term of the order $(\alpha Z)^4$ is meaningful for sufficiently small values of Z only. In the high-Z region, addition of this term makes the αZ-expansion results deviate more from the "exact" numerical values. We thus include the contribution (25) for $Z \leq 30$ only. The relative uncertainty of the two-loop binding QED correction for $Z \leq 30$ was estimated as the ratio of the part of the one-loop QED correction that is of order $(\alpha Z)^5$ and higher to the part that is within the $(\alpha Z)^4$ approximation [19], multiplied by a factor of 4. For $Z > 30$, we estimate the relative uncertainty by the ratio of the part of the one-loop QED correction that is of order $(\alpha Z)^4$ and higher to the part that is within the $(\alpha Z)^2$ approximation, multiplied by a factor of 2.

V. SCREENED QED CORRECTIONS

In this section we investigate the influence of the interelectronic interaction on the QED effects, known also as the "screening" of QED corrections. To derive the screened QED correction of first order in $1/Z$, we apply an approximate method, which yields the complete result to the order $(\alpha Z)^2$. Following Hegstrom [39], we adopt the Hamiltonian

$$H \ = \sum_j h(j) + \sum_j h^{\rm rad}(j) + H^{\rm int}, \tag{26}$$

where h is defined by Eq. (5), $H^{\rm int}$ incorporates the interelectronic interaction within the Breit approximation (8), and $h^{\rm rad}$ accounts for the interaction of the anomalous magnetic moment of electron with the magnetic and electric fields,

$$h^{\rm rad} \ = \ \frac{g_{\rm free} - 2}{2}\, \mu_0 \, [\beta(\mathbf{\Sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}) - i\beta(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}})] \, . \tag{27}$$

Here

$$g_{\rm free} = 2 \sum_i \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^i A^{(i)} \tag{28}$$

is the free-electron g factor and $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\sigma} \end{pmatrix}$. The magnetic field $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}(j)$ acting on the jth electron in Eq. (27) includes the external homogeneous magnetic field $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}$ and the field induced by the other electrons

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}(j) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{e}{4\pi} \frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k \times \mathbf{r}_{jk}}{r_{jk}^3} \, , \tag{29}$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{jk} = \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k$. The electric field $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}(j)$ includes the fields induced by nucleus and by the other electrons

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}(j) = \frac{|e|Z}{4\pi}\frac{\mathbf{r}_j}{r_j^3} + \sum_{k\neq j}\frac{e}{4\pi}\frac{\mathbf{r}_{jk}}{r_{jk}^3}\,. \tag{30}$$

We divide the contribution arising from $h^{\rm rad}$ into three parts,

$$H_1^{\rm rad} = \frac{g_{\rm free}-2}{2}\,\mu_0\sum_j \beta_j(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}\cdot\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j)\,, \tag{31}$$

$$H_2^{\rm rad} = \frac{g_{\rm free}-2}{2}\,\mu_0\,\frac{|e|Z}{4\pi}(-i)\sum_j \beta_j\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j\cdot\mathbf{r}_j}{r_j^3}\,, \tag{32}$$

$$H_3^{\rm rad} = \frac{g_{\rm free}-2}{2}\,\mu_0\,\frac{e}{4\pi}\sum_{j\neq k}\left(\beta_j\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j\cdot\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k\times\mathbf{r}_{jk}}{r_{jk}^3} - i\beta_j\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j\cdot\mathbf{r}_{jk}}{r_{jk}^3}\right)\,. \tag{33}$$

The matrices $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$, β_j, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j$ here act on the spinor variables of the jth electron. To first order in $1/Z$, the screened QED correction to the g factor can be now derived by the standard Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory, separating corrections linear in the magnetic field $\mathcal{H}$, which are of first order in the parameter $1/Z$. The contributions of interest can be conventionally represented by the following combinations:

$$\Delta E_1 \sim H_1^{\rm rad}\times H^{\rm int} + ({\rm permutations})\,, \tag{34}$$

$$\Delta E_2 \sim H_2^{\rm rad}\times V^{\rm magn}\times H^{\rm int} + ({\rm permutations})\,, \tag{35}$$

$$\Delta E_3 \sim H_3^{\rm rad}\times V^{\rm magn} + ({\rm permutations})\,. \tag{36}$$

After angular integration, the summation over the complete Dirac-Coulomb spectrum was performed by the finite basis set method with basis functions constructed from B splines [40, 41]. The numerical results for the screened QED correction of first order in $1/Z$, $\Delta g^{(1)}_{\rm SQED}$, are presented in Table IV in terms of the function $R(\alpha Z)$, defined as

$$\Delta g^{(1)}_{\rm SQED} = (g_{\rm free}-2)\,\frac{(\alpha Z)^2}{Z}\,R(\alpha Z)\,. \tag{37}$$

The terms $R_i(\alpha Z)$ with $i = 1, 2$, and 3 are induced by Eqs. (34)-(36), respectively.

The screened QED correction of higher orders in $1/Z$ should be accounted for when considering low-Z ions. We extract this correction from the recent evaluations by Yan [30, 31], which were performed on nonrelativistic wave functions but with the interelectronic interaction taken into account to all orders in $1/Z$. Yan's results for the screened QED correction can be represented in the form

$$\Delta g_{\rm SQED}({\rm Yan}) = (g_{\rm free} - 2)\,(\alpha Z)^2\,\left[\frac{1}{Z}R(0) + \frac{1}{Z^2}Q(0) + \ldots\right]\,, \tag{38}$$

where $R(0) = -274/2187$. The functions $R, Q, \ldots$ here do not have any dependence on Z since Yan's calculations are based on the nonrelativistic form of the Hamiltonian (26). We obtain the numerical value of $Q(0)$ by fitting Yan's results for $Z = 3$–12 to the form (38), which yields $Q(0) = 0.071(1)$. With this value of $Q(0)$, formula (38) was used to estimate the higher-order screened QED correction for $Z > 12$.

In Table V we present the results for the screened QED correction of first order in $1/Z$ ($\Delta g^{(1)}_{\rm SQED}$) and of higher orders in $1/Z$ ($\Delta g^{(2+)}_{\rm SQED}$). The error of the term $\Delta g^{(1)}_{\rm SQED}$ was estimated as the part of the one-electron QED correction that is beyond the $(\alpha Z)^2$ approximation, multiplied by a factor $3/Z$. The uncertainty ascribed to the $\Delta g^{(2+)}_{\rm SQED}$ contribution was evaluated as $3\,(\alpha Z)^2\,\Delta g^{(2+)}_{\rm SQED}$.

VI. NUCLEAR EFFECTS

In this section we briefly summarize the known results for the nuclear effects on the g factor of Li-like ions. The correction to the Dirac g-factor value due to the extended nuclear size is relatively simple. For high-Z ions, it is evaluated numerically by employing the Fermi model for the nuclear-charge distribution. The uncertainty is estimated by taking the difference of the results obtained for the Fermi and sphere nuclear models. For low-Z ions, to a good accuracy, this correction can be evaluated by a simple analytical formula obtained in Ref. [12],

$$\Delta g_{\rm NS} = \frac{1}{3}(\alpha Z)^4 m^2 \langle r^2\rangle \left[1 + (\alpha Z)^2\left(\frac{35}{16} - C - \frac{\langle r^2 \ln(\alpha Z m r)\rangle}{\langle r^2\rangle}\right)\right]\,. \tag{39}$$

Here $C = 0.5772156649\ldots$ is the Euler constant and the expectation value has to be evaluated with the proper nuclear-charge density.

Systematic QED theory for the nuclear-recoil effect on the atomic g factor to the first order in m/M and to all orders in αZ was developed in Ref. [13]. The one-electron recoil correction derived in that work is expressed as the sum of the lower-order and the higher-order term. The first one can be calculated analytically to yield for the $2s$ state (cf. [13])

$$\Delta g_{\mathrm{rec,L}} = \frac{m}{M}\frac{(\alpha Z)^2}{4}\left\{1+(\alpha Z)^2\frac{14+6\gamma+12\sqrt{2(1+\gamma)}}{3(1+\gamma)^2\big[2+\sqrt{2(1+\gamma)}\,\big]^2}\right\}\,, \tag{40}$$

where $\gamma = \sqrt{1-(\alpha Z)^2}$. The higher-order term $\Delta g_{\mathrm{rec,H}}$ was calculated numerically in Ref. [15] for the $1s$ state only. These numerical results showed the $(\alpha Z)^5$ behaviour of this term at low Z. We estimate the relative uncertainty of the result (40) due to neglecting the higher-order term as the ratio $\Delta g_{\mathrm{rec,H}}/\Delta g_{\mathrm{rec,L}}$ for the $1s$ state, multiplied by a factor of 1.5.

The contribution of the two-electron recoil effect can be extracted from the results of Yan [30, 31]. For $Z = 3 - 12$, it was evaluated as the difference of Yan's result of order $\alpha^2 m/M$ and the nonrelativistic limit of Eq. (40). Fitting this difference to the form

$$\Delta g_{\mathrm{rec}}^{\mathrm{two-el}} = \frac{m}{M}\frac{(\alpha Z)^2}{4}\left[\frac{1}{Z}C+\frac{1}{Z^2}D\ldots\right] \tag{41}$$

yields $C = -3.3(2)$. With this value of C, formula (41) was used to estimate the two-electron recoil correction for $Z > 12$.

Finally, we note that the nuclear polarization effect on the atomic g factor was evaluated in Ref. [24].

VII. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Table VI, we present the individual contributions to the g factor of the ground state of Li-like ions. The Dirac point-nucleus value is obtained by Eq. (6). The finite nuclear size correction to this value is evaluated by Eq. (39) for low-Z ions and by a direct numerical solution of the Dirac equation for high-Z ions. The interelectronic-interaction correction Δg_{int} is the sum of the part of first order in $1/Z$, $\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{(1)}$, obtained in framework of QED and of the higher-order part, $\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{(2+)}$, evaluated by the CI-DF method, as described in Section III. The QED correction of order α is the sum of the one-electron self-energy and vacuum-polarization terms presented in Table III. The QED correction of order α^2 and higher incorporates the known terms of the αZ expansion, as explained in Section IV. The screened QED correction is discussed in Section V, the corresponding results are taken from Table V. The nuclear recoil correction is obtained as explained in Section VI. For lead and uranium, we include also the nuclear-polarization correction calculated in Ref. [24].

Table VI demonstrates a significant improvement achieved comparing to our previous evaluations [25, 26]. The uncertainty of the presented theoretical values for carbon and oxygen is 2 and 3 times better than those of Ref. [26], respectively; whereas for uranium the accuracy is improved by two orders of magnitude. Progress in the high-Z region is mainly due to the evaluation of the one-loop QED corrections to all order in αZ, while for low-Z ions it is largely due to the interelectronic-interaction correction and the screened QED correction.

The accuracy of the theoretical values in Table VI is several parts in 10^{-8} for low-Z ions and a few parts in 10^{-7} for middle-Z ions. It decreases further with Z increasing and reaches 5×10^{-6} for uranium. So, despite the achieved improvement, the accuracy for Li-like ions is still significantly lower than that for H-like ions [7, 15] and also than the precision that can be presently addressed in experiments [1, 2, 3]. In particular, the nearest aim of experimental investigations of the Mainz-GSI collaboration is the g factor of Li-like calcium. The anticipated experimental accuracy is at the ppb level, which can be compared with the relative theoretical error of 10^{-7} from Table VI.

The uncertainty of the present theoretical values is mainly defined by the interelectronic-interaction correction and by the screened QED correction. An improvement in the theoretical description of the interelectronic-interaction effects can be achieved by a rigorous QED treatment of the part of order $1/Z^2$ and by calculating the remainder within the Breit approximation. Such a program has been carried out for the Lamb shift in Li-like ions [42, 43, 44, 45]. However, a similar calculation for the g factor is going to be significantly more difficult due to the presence of the external magnetic interaction and requires a further development of methods of calculational QED. As to the screened QED correction, in the present work it was calculated to its leading order in αZ only. As a first step beyond this approximation, which can improve the results for this correction in the high-Z region, one may consider an evaluation of the one-loop QED corrections in an effective potential that partly accounts for the interelectronic-interaction effects [46, 47]. These two topics will be the subjects of our subsequent investigations.

In summary, we have presented calculations of the interelectronic-interaction, one-electron QED, and screened QED corrections to the g factor of the ground state of Li-like ions. This resulted in a significant improvement of theoretical predictions in a wide range of the nuclear-charge values Z. We have analyzed also perspectives for further progress in the theoretical description of these systems and for probing the QED effects in future experiments.

Acknowledgments

Valuable conversations with A.N. Artemyev, T. Beier, S. Djekic, P. Indelicato, H.-J. Kluge, W. Quint, and G. Werth are gratefully acknowledged. This work was supported in part by RFBR (Grants No. 04-02-17574, 03-02-33253a), by the Russian Ministry of Education (Grant No. E02-3.1-49), and by INTAS-GSI (Grant No. 03-54-3604). D.A.G. thanks for support from the foundation "Dynasty", the Russian Ministry of Education (Grant No. A03-2.9-261), the Max-Planck-Institut für Physik Komplexer Systeme and from DAAD during his research stays at TU Dresden. The work of V.M.S. was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung. V.A.Y. acknowledges the support of the foundation "Dynasty". G.P. and G.S. acknowledge financial support by the BMBF, DFG, and GSI.

---

[1] N. Hermanspahn, H. Häffner, H.-J. Kluge, W. Quint, S. Stahl, J. Verdú, and G. Werth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 427 (2000).

[2] H. Häffner, T. Beier, N. Hermanspahn, H.-J. Kluge, W. Quint, S. Stahl, J. Verdú, and G. Werth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5308 (2000).

[3] J. L. Verdú, S. Djekic, S. Stahl, T. Valenzuela, M. Vogel, G. Werth, T. Beier, H.-J. Kluge, and W. Quint, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 093002 (2004).

[4] S. A. Blundell, K. T. Cheng, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 1857 (1997).

[5] H. Persson, S. Salomonson, P. Sunnergren, and I. Lindgren, Phys. Rev. A **56**, R2499 (1997).

[6] T. Beier, I. Lindgren, H. Persson, S. Salomonson, P. Sunnergren, H. Häffner, and N. Hermanspahn, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 032510 (2000).

[7] V. A. Yerokhin, P. Indelicato, and V. M. Shabaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 143001 (2002); Can. J. Phys. **80**, 1249 (2002).

[8] V. A. Yerokhin, P. Indelicato, and V. M. Shabaev, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052503 (2004).

[9] S. G. Karshenboim, Phys. Lett. A **266**, 380 (2000).

[10] S. G. Karshenboim, V. G. Ivanov, and V. M. Shabaev, Can. J. Phys. **79**, 81 (2001); Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **120**, 546 (2001) [Sov. Phys. JETP **93**, 477 (2001)].

[11] S. G. Karshenboim, A. I. Milstein, Phys. Lett. B **549**, 321 (2002).

[12] D. A. Glazov and V. M. Shabaev, Phys. Lett. A **297**, 408 (2002).

[13] V. M. Shabaev, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 052104 (2002).

[14] A. Yelkhovsky, E-print, hep-ph/0108091 (2001).

[15] V. M. Shabaev and V. A. Yerokhin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 091801 (2002).

[16] A. P. Martynenko and R. N. Faustov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **120**, 539 (2001) [Sov. Phys. JETP **93**, 471 (2001)].

[17] A. Czarnecki, K. Melnikov, and A. Yelkhovsky, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012509 (2001).

[18] S. G. Karshenboim, in *The Hydrogen Atom*, edited by S. G. Karshenboim *et al.* (Springer, Berlin, 2001), p. 651.

[19] K. Pachucki, U. D. Jentschura, and V. A. Yerokhin, to be published.

[20] P. J. Mohr and B. N. Taylor, Rev. Mod. Phys. **72**, 351 (2000).

[21] T. Beier, H. Häffner, N. Hermanspahn, S.G. Karshenboim, H.-J. Kluge, W. Quint, S. Stahl, J. Verdú, and G. Werth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 011603 (2002).

[22] P. J. Mohr and B. N. Taylor, CODATA recommended values of the fundamental physical constants: 2002, to appear in Rev. Mod. Phys. (2004).

[23] G. Werth, H. Häffner, N. Hermanspahn, H.-J. Kluge, W. Quint, J. Verdú, in *The Hydrogen Atom* (Ref. [18]), p. 204.

[24] A. V. Nefiodov, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 081802 (2002).

[25] V. M. Shabaev, D. A. Glazov, M. B. Shabaeva, V. A. Yerokhin, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 062104 (2002).

[26] V. M. Shabaev, D. A. Glazov, M. B. Shabaeva, I. I. Tupitsyn, V. A. Yerokhin, T. Beier, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research B **205**, 20 (2003).

[27] R. A. Hegstrom, Phys. Rev. A **11**, 421 (1975).

[28] L. Veseth, Phys. Rev. A **22**, 803 (1980).

[29] E. Lindroth and A. Ynnerman, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 961 (1993).

[30] Z.-C. Yan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5683 (2001).

[31] Z.-C. Yan, J. Phys. B **35**, 1885 (2002).

[32] P. Indelicato, E. Lindroth, T. Beier, J. Bieron, A. M. Costa, I. Lindgren, J. P. Marques, A.-M. Mårtensson-Pendrill, M. C. Martins, M. A. Ourdane, F. Parente, P. Patte, G. C. Rodrigues, S. Salomonson, and J. P. Santos, Hyperfine Interactions **132**, 349 (2001).

[33] J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. A **22**, 348 (1980).

[34] M. H. Mittleman, Phys. Rev. A **24**, 1167 (1981).

[35] A. G. Fainshtein, N. L. Manakov, and A. A. Nekipelov, J. Phys. B **23**, 559 (1990).

[36] H. Grotch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **24**, 39 (1970).

[37] V. W. Hughes and T. Kinoshita, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, S133 (1999).

[38] T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 021803 (2003).

[39] R. A. Hegstrom, Phys. Rev. A **7**, 451 (1973).

[40] W. R. Johnson and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1126 (1986).

[41] W. R. Johnson, S. A. Blundell, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **37**, 307 (1988).

[42] O.M. Zherebtsov, V.M. Shabaev, and V.A. Yerokhin, Phys. Lett. A **277**, 227 (2000).

[43] V. A. Yerokhin, A. N. Artemyev, V. M. Shabaev, M. M. Sysak , O. M. Zherebtsov, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4699 (2000); Phys. Rev. A **64**, 032109 (2001).

[44] V.M. Shabaev, V.A. Yerokhin, O.M. Zherebtsov, A.N. Artemyev, M.M. Sysak, and G. Soff, Hyperfine Interactions **132**, 341 (2001).

[45] O. Yu. Andreev, L. N. Labzowsky, G. Plunien, G. Soff, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042513 (2001).

[46] P. Indelicato and J.P. Desclaux, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 5139 (1990).

[47] J. Sapirstein and K.T. Cheng, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 042501 (2002); **67**, 022512 (2003).

TABLE I: The interelectronic-interaction correction $\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}} = \Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{(1)} + \Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{(2+)}$. The contributions $\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{\mathrm{CI-DF}}$ and $\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{(2+)}$ are calculated for the point nucleus, whereas the correction $\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{(1)}$ – for the Fermi model of the nuclear-charge distribution. All values shown in units of 10^{-6}.

Z	$\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{\mathrm{CI-DF}}$	$\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{(2+)}$	$\Delta g_{\mathrm{int}}^{(1)}$	Δg_{int}
3	61.591	−7.082	68.676	61.594 (10)
4	84.822	−6.752	91.591	84.839 (12)
5	107.806	−6.679	114.493	107.814 (14)
6	130.745	−6.661	137.419	130.758 (19)
8	176.627	−6.662	183.320	176.658 (30)
10	222.571	−6.673	229.301	222.628 (42)
12	268.604	−6.682	275.385	268.703 (55)
14	314.744	−6.689	321.592	314.903 (74)
16	361.011	−6.695	367.939	361.244 (94)
18	407.422	−6.699	414.451	407.75 (12)
20	453.994	−6.702	461.148	454.45 (14)
24	547.70	−6.71	555.18	548.48 (21)
32	737.93	−6.71	746.46	739.75 (37)
54	1291.39	−6.81	1306.22	1299.4 (1.1)
82	2120.76	−7.64	2148.29	2140.7 (2.7)
92	2481.67	−8.48	2509.84	2501.4 (3.8)

TABLE II: The comparison of the present CI-DF calculations of the g factor and the values obtained by Yan [30, 31]. The second column presents our $g-2$ values, incorporating the effects of binding and electron correlation. The α^2 limit is shown in the third column. Yan's contribution to the $g-2$ value of order α^2 is listed in third column. All numbers are in units of 10^{-6}

Z	$g-2$ (CI-DF)	$g-2$ (CI-DF, $\sim\alpha^2$)	$g-2$ (Yan [30, 31])
3	-18.298	-18.293	-18.283
4	-57.220	-57.206	-57.209
5	-114.167	-114.123	-114.132
6	-188.955	-188.845	-188.859
8	-391.994	-391.580	-391.599
10	-666.382	-665.326	-665.348
12	-1012.504	-1010.072	-1010.096

TABLE III: One-electron self-energy and vacuum-polarization corrections of first order in α. $\Delta g_{\rm VP}^{\rm e,U}$ and $\Delta g_{\rm VP}^{\rm e,WK}$ are the Uehling and the Wichmann-Kroll part of the electric-loop vacuum-polarization contribution, respectively; $\Delta g_{\rm VP}^{(1)} = \Delta g_{\rm VP}^{\rm e,U} + \Delta g_{\rm VP}^{\rm e,WK} + \Delta g_{\rm VP}^{\rm m}$. All contributions are calculated with the point nuclear model. Units are 10^{-6}.

Z	$\Delta g_{\rm SE}^{(1)}$	$\Delta g_{\rm VP}^{\rm e,U}$	$\Delta g_{\rm VP}^{\rm e,WK}$	$\Delta g_{\rm VP}^{\rm m}$	$\Delta g_{\rm VP}^{(1)}$	$\Delta g_{\rm QED}^{(1)}$
4	2322.905 1 (4)	−0.000 215	0.000 000	0.000 001	−0.000 214	2322.904 9 (4)
6	2323.018 3 (6)	−0.001 070	0.000 000	0.000 005	−0.001 065	2323.017 2 (6)
8	2323.185 (1)	−0.003 326	0.000 002	0.000 020	−0.003 304	2323.182 (1)
10	2323.413 (2)	−0.008 00	0.000 01	0.000 06	−0.007 93	2323.405 (2)
12	2323.707 (2)	−0.016 35	0.000 02	0.000 15 (1)	−0.016 18 (1)	2323.691 (2)
14	2324.074 (3)	−0.029 92	0.000 06	0.000 33 (2)	−0.029 53 (2)	2324.044 (3)
16	2324.520 (3)	−0.050 48	0.000 12	0.000 64 (4)	−0.049 71 (4)	2324.470 (3)
18	2325.052 (5)	−0.080 06	0.000 25	0.001 16 (8)	−0.078 66 (8)	2324.973 (5)
20	2325.674 (5)	−0.121 0	0.000 5	0.002 0 (2)	−0.118 6 (2)	2325.555 (5)
24	2327.225 (5)	−0.247 5	0.001 3	0.004 9 (5)	−0.241 3 (5)	2326.984 (5)
32	2331.726 (6)	−0.772	0.007	0.021 (3)	−0.745 (3)	2330.981 (7)
54	2358.184 (9)	−6.652	0.138	0.28 (8)	−6.23 (8)	2351.95 (8)
82	2456.245 (9)	−48.266	1.886	2.3 (8)	−44.1 (8)	2412.1 (8)
92	2532.207 (9)	−93.309	4.260	4.0 (1.5)	−85.0 (1.5)	2447.2 (1.5)

TABLE IV: Individual contributions to the screened QED correction of order $1/Z$ in terms of the function $R(\alpha Z)$ defined by Eq. (37). The terms R_i with $i = 1, 2, 3$ are induced by Eqs. (34)-(36), respectively. The results in the last column are obtained for the extended-charge nucleus, whereas all the other results correspond to the point nuclear model.

Z	R_1	R_2	R_3	$R(\alpha Z)$	$R_{\rm f.n.}(\alpha Z)$
4	0.1134	$-$0.1139	$-$0.1253	$-$0.1258	$-$0.1258
6	0.1135	$-$0.1144	$-$0.1254	$-$0.1264	$-$0.1264
8	0.1135	$-$0.1153	$-$0.1254	$-$0.1272	$-$0.1272
10	0.1136	$-$0.1163	$-$0.1255	$-$0.1283	$-$0.1283
12	0.1136	$-$0.1176	$-$0.1256	$-$0.1296	$-$0.1296
14	0.1137	$-$0.1192	$-$0.1258	$-$0.1312	$-$0.1312
16	0.1138	$-$0.1210	$-$0.1259	$-$0.1331	$-$0.1331
18	0.1140	$-$0.1231	$-$0.1261	$-$0.1352	$-$0.1352
20	0.1141	$-$0.1255	$-$0.1263	$-$0.1377	$-$0.1377
24	0.1144	$-$0.1311	$-$0.1268	$-$0.1435	$-$0.1435
32	0.1152	$-$0.1465	$-$0.1280	$-$0.1593	$-$0.1590
54	0.1188	$-$0.2324	$-$0.1336	$-$0.2473	$-$0.2436
82	0.1274	$-$0.6196	$-$0.1491	$-$0.6412	$-$0.5568
92	0.1324	$-$1.0501	$-$0.1588	$-$1.0765	$-$0.8103

TABLE V: The total screened QED correction. $\Delta g^{(1)}_{\rm SQED}$ and $\Delta g^{(2+)}_{\rm SQED}$ are the screened QED contribution of first and of higher orders in $1/Z$, respectively. All numbers are in units of 10^{-6}.

Z	$\Delta g^{(1)}_{\rm SQED}$	$\Delta g^{(2+)}_{\rm SQED}$	$\Delta g_{\rm SQED}$
4	$-$0.0621 (21)	0.00889 (2)	$-$0.0532 (21)
6	$-$0.0936 (60)	0.00879 (5)	$-$0.0848 (60)
8	$-$0.126 (12)	0.0088 (1)	$-$0.117 (12)
10	$-$0.158 (21)	0.0087 (1)	$-$0.150 (21)
12	$-$0.192 (32)	0.0087 (2)	$-$0.183 (32)
14	$-$0.227 (46)	0.0087 (3)	$-$0.218 (46)
16	$-$0.263 (62)	0.0087 (4)	$-$0.254 (62)
18	$-$0.301 (81)	0.0087 (5)	$-$0.292 (81)
20	$-$0.34 (10)	0.0087 (6)	$-$0.33 (10)
24	$-$0.43 (15)	0.009 (1)	$-$0.42 (15)
32	$-$0.63 (27)	0.009 (1)	$-$0.62 (27)
54	$-$1.6 (8)	0.009 (4)	$-$1.6 (8)
82	$-$5.6(2.0)	0.009 (9)	$-$5.6(2.0)
92	$-$9.2(2.6)	0.009 (12)	$-$9.2(2.6)

TABLE VI: Individual contributions to the ground-state g factor of Li-like ions.

	$^{12}\mathrm{C}^{3+}$	$^{16}\mathrm{O}^{5+}$	$^{20}\mathrm{Ne}^{7+}$	$^{24}\mathrm{Mg}^{9+}$
Dirac value (point nucleus)	1.999 680 300	1.999 431 380	1.999 110 996	1.998 718 893
Finite nuclear size	0.000 000 000	0.000 000 000	0.000 000 001	0.000 000 001
Interelectronic interaction	0.000 130 758 (19)	0.000 176 658 (30)	0.000 222 628 (42)	0.000 268 703 (55)
QED, $\sim \alpha$	0.002 323 017 (1)	0.002 323 182 (1)	0.002 323 405 (2)	0.002 323 691 (2)
QED, $\sim \alpha^2$	−0.000 003 515	−0.000 003 515	−0.000 003 516	−0.000 003 516
Screened QED	−0.000 000 085 (6)	−0.000 000 117 (12)	−0.000 000 150 (21)	−0.000 000 183 (32)
Nuclear recoil	0.000 000 010	0.000 000 017	0.000 000 025	0.000 000 032
Total	2.002 130 485 (19)	2.001 927 604 (32)	2.001 653 389 (47)	2.001 307 619 (64)

	$^{32}\mathrm{S}^{13+}$	$^{40}\mathrm{Ar}^{15+}$	$^{40}\mathrm{Ca}^{17+}$	$^{52}\mathrm{Cr}^{21+}$
Dirac value (point nucleus)	1.997 718 193	1.997 108 781	1.996 426 011	1.994 838 064
Finite nuclear size	0.000 000 005	0.000 000 009	0.000 000 014	0.000 000 035
Interelectronic interaction	0.000 361 24 (9)	0.000 407 75 (12)	0.000 454 45 (14)	0.000 548 48 (21)
QED, $\sim \alpha$	0.002 324 470 (3)	0.002 324 973 (5)	0.002 325 555 (5)	0.002 326 984 (5)
QED, $\sim \alpha^2$	−0.000 003 516 (1)	−0.000 003 517 (1)	−0.000 003 517 (2)	−0.000 003 518 (6)
Screened QED	−0.000 000 25 (6)	−0.000 000 29 (8)	−0.000 000 33 (10)	−0.000 000 42 (15)
Nuclear recoil	0.000 000 046 (1)	0.000 000 048 (1)	0.000 000 061 (2)	0.000 000 070 (4)
Total	2.000 400 19 (11)	1.999 837 75 (14)	1.999 202 24 (17)	1.997 709 70 (26)

	$^{74}\mathrm{Ge}^{29+}$	$^{132}\mathrm{Xe}^{51+}$	$^{208}\mathrm{Pb}^{79+}$	$^{238}\mathrm{U}^{89+}$
Dirac value (point nucleus)	1.990 752 307	1.972 750 205	1.932 002 904	1.910 722 624 (1)
Finite nuclear size	0.000 000 162	0.000 003 37 (1)	0.000 078 64 (16)	0.000 241 83 (47)
Interelectronic interaction	0.000 739 75 (37)	0.001 299 4 (11)	0.002 140 7 (27)	0.002 501 4 (38)
QED, $\sim \alpha$	0.002 330 981 (7)	0.002 351 95 (8)	0.002 412 1 (8)	0.002 447 2 (15)
QED, $\sim \alpha^2$	−0.000 003 523 (24)	−0.000 003 54 (13)	−0.000 003 6 (5)	−0.000 003 6 (8)
Screened QED	−0.000 000 62 (27)	−0.000 001 6 (8)	−0.000 005 6 (20)	−0.000 009 2 (26)
Nuclear recoil	0.000 000 092 (9)	0.000 000 16 (6)	0.000 000 25 (35)	0.000 000 28 (69)
Nuclear polarization			−0.000 000 04 (2)	−0.000 000 27 (14)
Total	1.993 819 14 (46)	1.976 399 9 (14)	1.936 625 3(35)	1.915 900 2(50)